IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI EASTERN DIVISION

RICKY WILSON, PLAINTIFF

V. NO. 1:05CV135-P-D

JOYCE RAYFORD, DEFENDANT

OPINION

This matter is before the court, *sua sponte*, for consideration of dismissal. Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, states that he bought an automobile from the defendant. He alleges that she has now told him that she had no title to the car and that she told him this before he paid her for it. He

contends that she told him that she did in fact have title, and that she would transfer title to the

plaintiff.

After carefully considering the contents of the pro se complaint and giving it the liberal

construction required by Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), this court has come to the following

conclusion.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. Since both parties are residents of

Mississippi, there must be a substantial federal question in order for jurisdiction to exist. See 28

U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332. The burden is on the party asserting federal jurisdiction to show that a

substantial federal question exists. As stated in 28 U.S.C. § 1331 "[t]he district courts shall have

original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United

States." Plaintiff's claims do not rise to the level of a constitutional violation; therefore, this court

has no jurisdiction to entertain his complaint.

For the above reasons, the case must be dismissed. A final judgment in accordance with this

opinion will be entered.

THIS the 6<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2005.

/s/ W. Allen Pepper, Jr.

W. ALLEN PEPPER, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE